

B1

means for storing identification information at least in part
identifying the first portion and for communicating at least a
portion of the identification information to a remote site.

REMARKS

The present application is a continuation of immediate parent application Ser. No. 09/335,465, filed June 17, 1999 ("the parent application"). With this continuation application, Applicants file this Preliminary Amendment adding new Claims 91-139, which correspond to Claims 91-105 and 114-147 from the parent application. In an Office action dated July 7, 2000 ("the Office Action"), in the parent application, the Examiner rejected claims 91-105, 114-117, and 121-147 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,827,508 to Shear ("Shear '508"). Additionally, the Examiner rejected Claims 91-105 and 114-147 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,103,392 to Mori. To expedite prosecution, Applicants will address these rejections in this Preliminary Amendment.

Applicants disagree with the rejection of former Claims 91-105 (new Claims 91-105), 114-117 (new Claims 106-111) and 121-128 (new Claims 113-120) based on Shear '508. (We note that former Claims 118-20 (new Claims 110-112) were not rejected on the basis of Shear '508.) In particular, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Shear '508 as teaching or disclosing the first and second secure containers specified in former Claim 91. As is specified in Claim 91, the first secure container contains the second secure

container, which in turns contains the first protected information. Nothing similar to this is recited or suggested in Shear '508.

Applicants also disagree with the rejection of former Claims 129-130 (new Claims 121-122) for the same reasons, since independent claim 129 (new Claim 121) includes each of the limitations discussed above in connection with Claim 91.

Applicants further disagree with the rejection of former Claims 131-134, 146, and 147 (new Claims 123-126, 138, and 139, respectively) for similar reasons. These claims require three containers, one of them being used to transfer information between the other two. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, nothing like this is found in Shear '508.

Applicants disagree with the rejection of former Claims 135-145 (new Claims 127-137) for similar reasons. Former Claim 135 (new Claim 127) recites a first secure container that is stored in a first memory and a second secure container that is stored in a second memory. For at least this reason, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion that a secure container in the claimed invention reads on storage medium 100, since storage medium 100, unlike a secure container, cannot obviously be stored in a memory.

Additionally, Applicants disagree with the rejection of former Claims 91-105 and 114-147 (new Claims 91-139) based on U.S. Patent No. 5,103,392 to Mori. As is described above, each of the independent claims requires multiple containers, as well as the incorporation of information from one of the secure containers into another of the secure containers. Mori neither discloses nor

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
STANFORD RESEARCH PARK
700 HANSEN WAY
PALO ALTO, CALIF. 94304
650-849-6600

suggests anything resembling the claimed elements. Even assuming that the Mori program storage elements can constitute a secure container, Mori does not show the use of a secure container to transfer information between other secure containers.

Furthermore, Applicants note that the Examiner cited no specific support for the assertion that "[t]he recited second secure container reads on the program information being transferred or used at the user site." (Office Action at 3). Applicants note also that the Examiner provided no specific basis for the claim that "program information" constitutes a secure container. Indeed, Applicants were unable to find support in Mori for such statements and therefore respectfully submit that former Claims 91-105 and 114-147 (new Claims 91-139) are patentable over Mori.

For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully suggest that new Claims 91-139 are patentable over Shear '508 and Mori, and respectfully request that the new claims be allowed as written.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, including fees for extension of time, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 18, 2001

By: Linda J. Thayer
Linda J. Thayer
Reg. No. 45,681